

1 MARC M. SELTZER (54534)
 2 mselzter@susmangodfrey.com
 3 KRYSTA KAUBLE PACHMAN (280951)
 4 kpachman@susmangodfrey.com
 5 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 6 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
 7 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 8 Telephone: (310) 789-3100
 9 Facsimile: (310) 789-3150

10 ANDREW J. ENTWISTLE (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 11 aentwistle@entwistle-law.com
 12 ENTWISTLE & CAPPUCCI LLP
 13 401 Congress Avenue, Suite 1170
 14 Austin, TX 78701
 15 Telephone: (512) 710-5960
 16 Facsimile: (212) 894-7272

17 P. RYAN BURNINGHAM (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 18 rburningham@susmangodfrey.com
 19 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 20 1201 Third Ave., Suite 3800
 21 Seattle, WA 98101
 22 Telephone: (206) 516-3800
 23 Facsimile: (206) 516-3883

24 VINCENT R. CAPPUCCI (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 25 vcappucci@entwistle-law.com
 26 BRENDAN J. BRODEUR (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 27 bbrodeur@entwistle-law.com
 28 ANDREW M. SHER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 29 asher@entwistle-law.com
 30 ENTWISTLE & CAPPUCCI LLP
 31 299 Park Avenue, 20th Floor
 32 New York, NY 10171
 33 Telephone: (212) 894-7200
 34 Facsimile: (212) 894-7272

35 CHRISTOPHER J. KELLER
 36 (*Pro Hac Vice* forthcoming)
 37 ckeller@labaton.com
 38 FRANCIS P. McCONVILLE
 39 (*Pro Hac Vice* forthcoming)
 40 fmcconville@labaton.com
 41 LABATON SUCHAROW LLP
 42 140 Broadway
 43 New York, New York 10005
 44 Telephone: (212) 907-0700
 45 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477

46 *Attorneys for the Arbitrage Plaintiffs and Proposed Lead Counsel*

47 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 48 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 49 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

50 CHRISTOPHER L. SAYCE, Individually and On
 51 Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

52 Case No. 3:20-CV-00076-SI

53 Plaintiff,

54 **MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT AS**
LEAD PLAINTIFFS AND FOR
APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF
LEAD COUNSEL

55 vs.
 56 FORESCOUT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
 57 MICHAEL DECESARE, AND CHRISTOPHER
 58 HARMS,

59 DATE: Friday, November 6, 2020
 60 TIME: 10:00 a.m.
 61 Courtroom 1, 17th Floor

62 Defendants.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Please take notice that The Arbitrage Fund; Water Island LevArb Fund, LP; Water Island Diversified Event-Driven Fund; Water Island Merger Arbitrage Institutional Comingled Master Fund, LP; and AltShares Merger Arbitrage ETF (the “Water Island Funds”); together with S. Muoio & Co. LLC and Amethyst Arbitrage International Master Fund (with the Water Island Funds, the “Arbitrage Plaintiffs”) move for appointment as lead plaintiffs and for approval of their choice of lead counsel. This motion will be heard before the Honorable Susan Illston at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, November 6, 2020, or at a time to be determined by the Court.

STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

11 Pursuant to Section 21D(a)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-
12 4(a)(3)(B), the Arbitrage Plaintiffs move for appointment as lead plaintiffs for a proposed class
13 consisting of all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of
14 defendant Forescout Technologies, Inc. during the period from February 7, 2019, through May 15,
15 2020, inclusive, and were damaged thereby. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(v), the
16 Arbitrage Plaintiffs also move for approval of their counsel (Susman Godfrey L.L.P., Entwistle &
17 Cappucci LLP and Labaton Sucharow LLP) to serve as lead counsel to represent the class.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | |
|----|------|--|---|
| 1 | I. | LEGAL STANDARD | 1 |
| 2 | II. | PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND..... | 2 |
| 3 | III. | MOTION TO BE APPOINTED LEAD PLAINTIFFS | 3 |
| 4 | A. | This motion is timely | 3 |
| 5 | B. | The Arbitrage Plaintiffs have the largest financial interest in the relief | |
| 6 | | sought | 3 |
| 7 | C. | The Arbitrage Plaintiffs satisfy Rule 23..... | 4 |
| 8 | 1. | The Arbitrage Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class | 4 |
| 9 | 2. | The Arbitrage Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the | |
| 10 | | interests of the Class..... | 5 |
| 11 | D. | The Court should approve the Arbitrage Plaintiffs' choice of counsel..... | 7 |
| 12 | IV. | CONCLUSION..... | 8 |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | | |
|----|--|------|
| 3 | <i>Curry v. Hansen Med., Inc.</i> , | |
| 4 | No. 5:09-cv-05094-JF (HRL), 2010 WL 702432 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2010) | 5 |
| 5 | <i>Erikson v. Cornerstone Propane Partners LP</i> , | |
| 6 | No. C 03-2522 MHP, 2003 WL 22232387 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2003)..... | 4, 5 |
| 7 | <i>Ferrari v. Gisch</i> , | |
| 8 | 225 F.R.D. 599 (C.D. Cal. 2004) | 5 |
| 9 | <i>Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.</i> , | |
| 10 | 976 F.2d 497 (9th Cir. 1992)..... | 4 |
| 11 | <i>In re Cavanaugh</i> , | |
| 12 | 306 F.3d 726 (9th Cir. 2002)..... | 3 |
| 13 | <i>In re Cendant Corp. Litig.</i> , | |
| 14 | 264 F.3d 201 (3d Cir. 2001)..... | 6 |
| 15 | <i>Knox v. Yingli Green Energy Holding Co. Ltd.</i> , | |
| 16 | 136 F. Supp. 3d 1159 (C.D. Cal. 2015)..... | 3 |
| 17 | <i>Schriver v. Impac Mort. Holdings, Inc.</i> , | |
| 18 | No. SACV 06-31 CJC(RNBx), 2006 WL 6886020 (C.D. Cal. May 2, 2006)..... | 4 |
| 19 | <i>Takara Trust v. Molex Inc.</i> , | |
| 20 | 229 F.R.D. 577 (N.D. Ill. 2005) | 3 |
| 21 | <i>Tanne v. Autobytel, Inc.</i> , | |
| 22 | 226 F.R.D. 659 (C.D. Cal. 2005) | 5 |
| 23 | Statutes | |
| 24 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(1)..... | 1 |
| 25 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(A)(i) | 1 |
| 26 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B) | 4 |
| 27 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I) | 1 |
| 28 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I)(aa) | 3 |
| 29 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(II) | 1 |
| 30 | 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(v) | 7 |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u-4(a)(3)(B) | 1 |
| 2 | Rules | |
| 3 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3) | 4 |
| 4 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4) | 5 |
| 5 | Other Authorities | |
| 6 | H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 104-369 (1995), <i>reprinted in</i> 1995 U.S.C.C.A.N. 730 (1995) | 6 |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |

1

2 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

3 In securities class actions, courts must appoint the most adequate plaintiffs to serve as lead
 4 plaintiffs for the class. By law, a person or group of persons is presumed to be the most adequate
 5 plaintiff if it meets three conditions: (1) files a timely motion for appointment as lead plaintiff; (2)
 6 has the largest financial interest in the relief sought by the class; and (3) satisfies the requirements
 7 of Rule 23. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs meet these conditions and should be appointed as lead
 8 plaintiffs. In addition, their selected counsel should be approved to represent the class.

9 **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

10 The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”) governs the appointment of lead
 11 plaintiffs in this action. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u-4(a)(1) and (a)(3)(B). Under the PSLRA, plaintiffs
 12 have twenty days from filing the complaint to publish a notice advising members of the putative
 13 class concerning the pending action. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(A)(i). In response, any member
 14 or members of the putative class may move to serve as lead plaintiffs, provided they do so within
 15 sixty days after the notice is published. *See id.*

16 In appointing lead plaintiffs, the Court is tasked with identifying the class member or
 17 members “most capable of adequately representing the interests of class members.” *Id.* Under the
 18 PSLRA, the most adequate plaintiff is presumed to be the “person or groups of persons” that:

19 (a) has either filed the complaint or made a motion in response to a notice . . . ;
 20 (b) in the determination of the court, has the largest financial interest in the relief
 21 sought by the class; and
 22 (c) otherwise satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil
 23 Procedure.

24 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I). The presumption is rebuttable, but only by proof from a class
 25 member that the presumptive most adequate plaintiff “will not fairly and adequately protect the
 26 interests of the class” or “is subject to unique defenses that render such plaintiff incapable of
 27 adequately representing the class.” 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(II).

1 **II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

2 On January 2, 2020, plaintiff Christopher Sayce filed a complaint against Forescout
 3 Technologies, Inc., Michael DeCesare and Christopher Harms for violations of Sections 10(b) and
 4 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”). *See* ECF No. 1. Sayce’s complaint
 5 was brought on behalf of a class consisting of investors who acquired Forescout securities between
 6 February 7, 2019 and October 9, 2019, both dates inclusive. *Id.* The same day, Sayce’s counsel
 7 published notice of the lawsuit pursuant to the PSLRA. On March 23, 2020, this Court granted
 8 Meitav Tachlit’s unopposed motion for appointment as lead plaintiff. *See* ECF No. 27. Two months
 9 after that appointment – on May 22, 2020 – Meitav Tachlit filed an amended complaint that
 10 expanded the proposed class (the “Class”) to include persons or entities who purchased or otherwise
 11 acquired the common stock of Forescout between February 7, 2019 and May 15, 2020, both dates
 12 inclusive (the “Class Period”). *See* ECF No. 31.

13 On June 10, 2020, the Water Island Funds filed a separate complaint against the same
 14 defendants, also for violations of the Exchange Act. *See Arbitrage Fund v. Forescout Techs., Inc.*
 15 (“*Water Island Action*”), No. 3:20-cv-03819-SI, ECF No. 1. However, that complaint was brought
 16 on behalf of a narrower group of investors: those who purchased or otherwise acquired the common
 17 stock of Forescout during the period from February 6, 2020 through May 15, 2020, inclusive, and
 18 were damaged thereby. *Id.* The next day, counsel for the Water Island Funds published notice of
 19 that lawsuit.

20 Thereafter, on July 22, 2020, this Court consolidated the two cases. *See* ECF No. 55 at 10;
 21 *Water Island Action*, ECF No. 25 at 10. Because many members of the now-expanded Class did
 22 not receive notice of the subject claims and did not have an opportunity to seek appointment as lead
 23 plaintiffs, the Court vacated its order appointing Meitav Tachlit as lead plaintiff and ordered Meitav
 24 Tachlit to republish notice of the consolidated Class no later than July 31, 2020. *See id.* Meitav
 25 Tachlit’s counsel, Pomerantz LLP, published notice on July 29, 2020, setting a September 28, 2020
 26 deadline for Class members to move for appointment as lead plaintiffs. *See* Decl. of Marc M.
 27 Seltzer, Ex. C.

28

1 **III. MOTION TO BE APPOINTED LEAD PLAINTIFFS**

2 The Arbitrage Plaintiffs are presumptively the most adequate class members to serve as lead
 3 plaintiffs. They have filed a timely motion, have the largest financial interest and satisfy Rule 23's
 4 typicality and adequacy requirements, as discussed more fully below.

5 **A. This motion is timely**

6 The PSLRA's first requirement is simple: file a complaint or a timely motion. *See* 15 U.S.C.
 7 § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I)(aa). Here, notice was published on July 29, 2020. Accordingly, the deadline
 8 to file a motion to be appointed lead plaintiffs is September 28, 2020. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs are
 9 filing this motion on September 28, 2020, so the motion is timely, and the PSLRA's first
 10 requirement is satisfied.

11 **B. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs have the largest financial interest in the relief sought**

12 The PSLRA's second requirement concerns the relative financial interests of those seeking
 13 appointment as lead plaintiffs. The most adequate plaintiff is the person or group of persons with
 14 the most at stake. Consequently, the Court must "compare the financial stakes of the various
 15 plaintiffs and determine which one has the most to gain from the lawsuit." *In re Cavanaugh*, 306
 16 F.3d 726, 730 (9th Cir. 2002).

17 Comparing potential lead plaintiffs' financial interest in the litigation requires first
 18 calculating those interests. To this end, the Ninth Circuit recommends that the Court "select
 19 accounting methods that are both rational and consistently applied." *Id.* at n.4. Where, as here,
 20 potential lead plaintiffs' financial stakes depend on transactions of common stock, courts in this
 21 circuit typically consider the *Olsten-Lax* factors. *See Knox v. Yingli Green Energy Holding Co.*
 22 *Ltd.*, 136 F. Supp. 3d 1159, 1163 (C.D. Cal. 2015). Those factors are: "(1) the number of shares
 23 purchased during the class period; (2) the number of net shares purchased during the class period;
 24 (3) the total net funds expended during the class period; and (4) the approximate losses suffered."
 25 *Id.* Of the four factors, the last is most determinative. *Id.* Indeed, "most courts simply determine
 26 which potential lead plaintiff has suffered the greatest total losses." *Takara Trust v. Molex Inc.*, 229
 27 F.R.D. 577, 579 (N.D. Ill. 2005).

1 Here, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs believe they have the largest financial interest in the relief
 2 sought by the Class. Together, they purchased 2,508,595 shares (and 403,781 net shares) of
 3 Forescout common stock during the Class Period. Their funds expended during the Class Period
 4 total \$80,363,407.69, and their net funds expended total \$13,466,354.21. Their actual losses total
 5 approximately \$3.4 million. And their *Dura* losses total approximately \$2.75 million. *See* Decl. of
 6 Marc M. Seltzer, Ex. B. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs are presently unaware of any other Class member
 7 with a larger financial interest in the outcome of this litigation that has sought to be appointed lead
 8 plaintiff. Consequently, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs are presumptively the most adequate to serve as
 9 lead plaintiffs.

10 **C. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs satisfy Rule 23**

11 The PSLRA's third requirement is that the potential lead plaintiff "otherwise satisfies the
 12 requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B). In
 13 turn, Rule 23(a) lists four requirements for certifying a class: numerosity, commonality, typicality
 14 and adequacy. Of those, only two (typicality and adequacy) are relevant to selecting a lead plaintiff,
 15 and the prospective lead plaintiff need only make a preliminary showing. *See Erikson v.*
 16 *Cornerstone Propane Partners LP*, No. C 03-2522 MHP, 2003 WL 22232387, at *3 (N.D. Cal.
 17 Sept. 15, 2003) ("All that is required at this stage of litigation is a preliminary showing of typicality
 18 and adequacy."); *Schrivener v. Impac Mort. Holdings, Inc.*, No. SACV 06-31 CJC(RNBx), 2006 WL
 19 6886020, at *5 (C.D. Cal. May 2, 2006) ("At the lead plaintiff appointment stage, the Rule 23
 20 inquiry is not as searching as it would be on a motion for class certification; the prospective lead
 21 plaintiff need only make a *prima facie* showing that it meets the typicality and adequacy factors.").

22 As set forth below, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs satisfy Rule 23's typicality and adequacy
 23 requirements.

24 **1. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class**

25 A class representative's claims or defenses must be "typical of the claims or defenses of the
 26 class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). "The test of typicality is whether other members have the same or
 27 similar injury, whether the action is based on conduct which is not unique to the named plaintiffs,
 28

1 and whether other class members have been injured by the same course of conduct.” *Hanon v.*
 2 *Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497, 508 (9th Cir. 1992) (quotation omitted).

3 Typicality is straightforward in securities class actions, and this case is no exception. Just
 4 like other Class members, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs (1) acquired Forescout common stock during the
 5 Class Period, (2) at prices artificially inflated by defendants’ false and misleading statements and
 6 omissions and (3) suffered damage as a result. This action is based on defendants’ conduct – none
 7 of which is alleged to be unique as to any plaintiff, including the Arbitrage Plaintiffs. Moreover,
 8 though the extent of injury will differ from Class member to Class member, all damages suffered
 9 by the Class members arose out of the same course of conduct by the defendants. Courts find
 10 typicality in similar circumstances, requiring only that potential lead plaintiffs have traded in
 11 defendants’ securities and suffered losses during the class period. *See, e.g., Erikson*, 2003 WL
 12 22232387, at *3; *Tanne v. Autobytel, Inc.*, 226 F.R.D. 659, 667 (C.D. Cal. 2005). The same
 13 conclusion applies here: The Arbitrage Plaintiffs are typical of the Class.

14 **2. The Arbitrage Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the
 15 interests of the Class**

16 Representative parties must also “fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.”
 17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). A class representative is adequate when the representatives interests are
 18 not antagonistic to the interests of absent class members, it is unlikely that the action is collusive
 19 and counsel for the class is qualified and competent. *Curry v. Hansen Med., Inc.*, No. 5:09-cv-
 20 05094-JF (HRL), 2010 WL 702432, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2010). “In addition, the class
 21 representative must have a sufficient interest in the outcome of the case to ensure vigorous
 22 advocacy.” *Ferrari v. Gisch*, 225 F.R.D. 599, 607 (C.D. Cal. 2004).

23 The Arbitrage Plaintiffs meet these requirements. *First*, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs suffered
 24 substantial losses from defendants’ wrongdoing during the Class Period. Such substantial losses
 25 ensure that the Arbitrage Plaintiffs are highly invested in the case’s outcome and that their interests
 26 are aligned with the interests of other Class members. *See Ferrari*, 225 F.R.D. at 607 (suffering the
 27 greatest financial loss provides an incentive to prosecute the case vigorously). *Second*, there is no
 28 evidence of collusive action. *Third*, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs’ counsel are qualified and competent.

1 The firms (Susman Godfrey, Entwistle & Cappucci and Labaton Sucharow) are highly experienced
 2 in prosecuting securities class actions and highly successful in those prosecutions. *See infra* § IID.
 3 For these reasons, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs are adequate class representatives.

4 The Arbitrage Plaintiffs are also adequate representatives because they have experience
 5 working with legal counsel to litigate shareholder appraisal/dissenter rights matters, giving them a
 6 view of the responsibilities attendant with the lead plaintiff role and experience in managing
 7 counsel in securities cases. *See Decl. of Marc M. Seltzer, Ex. A.* ¶ 8. Before filing this motion, the
 8 Arbitrage Plaintiffs discussed the obligations of lead plaintiffs and procedures and mechanisms for
 9 communications and decision-making. *See id.* ¶¶ 11–12. They also agreed to function cohesively
 10 and established procedures for communication and overseeing the litigation. *See id.* The Class will
 11 benefit from representation by this small, cohesive group of sophisticated fiduciaries with diverse
 12 perspectives – a group committed to vigorously prosecuting the action in the best interests of the
 13 Class. *See id.* ¶¶ 9–10.

14 Not only are the Arbitrage Plaintiffs adequate representatives, they are ideal representatives
 15 according to Congress. One of the PSLRA’s goals is to encourage institutional investors to take the
 16 reins in securities class actions. *See H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 104-369, at *34 (1995), reprinted in 1995*
 17 *U.S.C.C.A.N. 730, 755 (1995)* (“increasing the role of institutional investors in class actions will
 18 ultimately benefit shareholders and assist courts by improving the quality of representations in
 19 securities class actions”). Federal courts have noted this Congressional preference for institutional
 20 investors like the Arbitrage Plaintiffs. *See, e.g., In re Cendant Corp. Litig.*, 264 F.3d 201, 243–44
 21 (3d Cir. 2001) (“The plaintiff with the largest stake in a given securities class action will almost
 22 invariably be a large institutional investor, and the PSLRA’s legislative history expressly states that
 23 Congress anticipated and intended that such investors would serve as lead plaintiffs.”).

24 Finally, certain of the Arbitrage Plaintiffs (the Water Island Funds) have demonstrated their
 25 adequacy by filing a detailed complaint against defendants. Moreover, in opposing the former lead
 26 plaintiff’s motion to consolidate, the Water Island Funds successfully requested that the Court order
 27 a new lead plaintiff selection process to allow qualified movants in the expanded Class Period to
 28 move for appointment as lead plaintiffs.

1 **D. The Court should approve the Arbitrage Plaintiffs' choice of counsel**

2 The Arbitrage Plaintiffs have selected the law firms of Susman Godfrey, Entwistle &
 3 Cappucci and Labaton Sucharow to serve as their counsel. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78u-
 4 (a)(3)(B)(v), that choice should be approved. Each firm possesses extensive experience
 5 successfully litigating securities class actions.

6 Susman Godfrey has served as lead counsel in hundreds of class actions and other complex
 7 commercial disputes in courts throughout the country. Susman Godfrey's practice is dedicated
 8 exclusively to litigating and trying lawsuits. The firm has represented clients in some of the largest
 9 and most complex cases ever litigated, and it has demonstrated that it has the ability and resources
 10 to handle those cases effectively and efficiently. Susman Godfrey's experience, track record of
 11 success and staying power are reflected in its wide recognition as one of the nation's leading trial
 12 firms, including by *The American Lawyer* in its first-ever "Litigation Boutique of the Year"
 13 competition. More recently, Susman Godfrey was named in 2017 as Law360's "Class Action
 14 Group of the Year" and has been listed as one of the "top 20 Trial Firms" by Benchmark Litigation.
 15 Every year from 2010 to 2020, Vault has ranked Susman Godfrey the "No. 1 Litigation Boutique."
 16 The firm's lawyers (over 90% of whom served as federal judicial law clerks) are also consistently
 17 recognized as "Super Lawyers" and "Rising Stars" in the states where they practice. Susman
 18 Godfrey has handled numerous private and class action cases resulting in significant recoveries for
 19 defrauded investors. For example, in *Schulein v. Petroleum Development Corp.*, No. 11-1891 (C.D.
 20 Cal.), Susman Godfrey obtained \$37.5 million for a class of limited partners who invested in oil
 21 and gas limited partnerships. Other significant cases in which Susman Godfrey served in a
 22 leadership capacity and obtained significant recoveries on behalf of the respective classes are set
 23 forth in the attached firm resume. *See Decl. of Marc M. Seltzer, Ex. D.*

24 Likewise, Entwistle & Cappucci has successfully prosecuted some of the largest and
 25 highest-profile securities class actions in history, distinguishing itself as one of the nation's premier
 26 complex litigation firms. It currently serves as lead counsel in many noteworthy securities class
 27 actions pending throughout the country. Entwistle & Cappucci's recent successes include *In re*
 28 *Cobalt International Energy, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 14-cv-3428 (S.D. Tex.). In *Cobalt*, Entwistle &

1 Cappucci, as court-appointed co-lead counsel for the class, achieved settlements totaling \$173.8
 2 million in cash, plus up to \$161.5 million payable from the proceeds of management liability
 3 policies which are subject to ongoing litigation led by the firm. Other significant cases in which
 4 Entwistle & Cappucci served in a leadership capacity and obtained significant recoveries on behalf
 5 of the respective classes are set forth in the attached firm resume. *See Decl. of Marc M. Seltzer, Ex.*
 6 *E.*

7 Similarly, Labaton Sucharow has demonstrated tremendous success in prosecuting
 8 securities class actions. For example, as co-lead counsel on behalf of purchasers of Massey Energy
 9 Company, Labaton Sucharow achieved a \$265 million all-cash settlement to resolve claims under
 10 Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act. *See In re Massey Energy Co. Sec. Litig.*, No. 10-cv-
 11 00689-ICB (S.D. W. Va.). And in *In re Schering-Plough Corp./Enhance Sec. Litig.*, No. 08-397
 12 (D.N.J.), after five years of litigation, the firm secured a \$473 million settlement for the defendant's
 13 failure to disclose material information to investors. Other significant cases in which Labaton
 14 Sucharow served in a leadership capacity and obtained significant recoveries on behalf of the
 15 respective classes are set forth in the attached firm resume. *See Decl. of Marc M. Seltzer, Ex. F.*

16 Susman Godfrey, Entwistle & Cappucci and Labaton Sucharow have also worked
 17 cooperatively together on a number of cases. Most recently, Susman Godfrey and Entwistle &
 18 Cappucci secured a \$40 million settlement for a class of derivatives traders in *Timber Hill v.*
 19 *Pershing Square Capital Mgmt. L.P., et al.*, No. 17-cv-4776. (C.D. Cal.). Labaton Sucharow and
 20 Entwistle & Cappucci are also currently working together to prosecute securities class actions on
 21 behalf of former shareholders of Alta Mesa Resources, Inc. (*see In re Alta Mesa Sec. Litig.*, Case
 22 No. 19-cv-00957 (S.D. Tex.)) and shareholders of Resideo Technologies, Inc. (*see In re Resideo*
 23 *Technologies, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 19-cv-02863 (D. Minn.)).

24 **IV. CONCLUSION**

25 Under the PSLRA, the Arbitrage Plaintiffs are presumptively the most adequate lead
 26 plaintiffs. They respectfully request that the Court grant this motion, appoint them to serve as lead
 27 plaintiffs and approve their selection of lead counsel for the Class.

28

1 Dated: September 28, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

2 Marc M. Seltzer
3 Krysta Kauble Pachman
4 P. Ryan Burningham
5 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

6 Andrew J. Entwistle
7 Vincent R. Cappucci
8 Brendan J. Brodeur
9 Andrew M. Sher
10 ENTWISTLE & CAPPUCCI LLP

11 Christopher J. Keller
12 Francis P. Mcconville
13 LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

14 By: /s/ Marc M. Seltzer
15 Marc M. Seltzer

16 *Attorneys for the Arbitrage Plaintiffs and Proposed
17 Lead Counsel*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28